DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 163 892 IR 005 607

AUTHOR Hardesty, Larry
TITLE Bibliographic Instruction: Defining, Organizing, and Promoting a Program.
PUB DATE 16 Nov 77
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented to the 1977-78 Recipients of the Council on Library Resources' Library Service Enhancement Program Grants (Washington, D.C., November 16, 1977); Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Libraries; Bibliographies; Definitions; Higher Education; Instructional Innovation; Library Circulation; *Library Instruction; Library Programs; *Program Development; Speeches; Use Studies

ABSTRACT

This basic discussion of the organization of bibliographic instruction programs in an academic setting includes consideration of factors involved in implementing an innovative program. Several stages in developing and organizing a systematic program are reviewed: creating student awareness of the academic library in general, introduction to use of the major collections of the library through a general search strategy, introduction to more specialized library resources in their major fields of study, and teaching upper level students relationships between the nature of a particular discipline and the nature of the organization of that discipline's literature. Acceptance of such a program hinges upon the program's innovativeness, which is characterized by relative advantage, compatibility, complexity, trialability, and observability. The social structure as well as the individual will most probably accept innovative programs through specific stages labeled awareness, interest, evaluation, trial, and adoption. (MBR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED163892

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION:

DEFINING, ORGANIZING, AND PROMOTING A PROGRAM

By

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Larry Hardesty
Head of the Reference Department

Roy O. West Library
DePauw University
Greencastle, Indiana

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Larry Hardesty

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Presented to the 1977-78 Recipients
of the Council on Library Resources'
Library Service Enhancement Program Grants

Washington, D. C.
November 16, 1977

IR005607

BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION:

DEFINING, ORGANIZING, AND PROMOTING A PROGRAM

by

Larry Hardesty
DePauw University

Introduction

When Leone Newkirk called me about a month ago to ask me to speak to this group about bibliographic instruction, I was a little hesitant. Bibliographic instruction is, of course, one of my favorite topics, and seldom do I turn down a trip to Washington, D. C. In fact, seldom do I have the opportunity to turn down such a trip, but I realized that you are a highly select group. You have been chosen out of perhaps hundreds of librarians because of your excellent proposals, and I think I can safely assume that you are familiar with the basic elements of bibliographic instruction and the literature on the subject. I wondered what I could say about bibliographic instruction to you so I wrote Leone, asking her to detail what she had in mind for my talk.

Leone responded by quoting the opening paragraph of the Guidelines for the College Library Program:

> We want to "increase the effectiveness and use of libraries in accredited . . . colleges and universities. The [College Library] program is based on the assumption that the academic library should and can be successfully integrated into the total learning program of its institution. This requires a cooperative effort by librarians and teaching faculty to

> plan and implement activities by students. The goal is to make the library a full partner in the educational process. . . ."

She then closed her letter by writing, "Now, if you can tell us all how to do that successfully. . . ."

After reading that, I felt not unlike one the characters in the Peanuts comic strip who says (and I will paraphrase the statement), "There's no heavier burden than great expectations." The Council on Library Resources has been most generous in support of my efforts both through the Library Service Enhancement Program and the College Library Program, and perhaps this is their way of telling me that the bill is coming due. In any case, I appreciate Leone's confidence in me, but I hope she is not disappointed today if I am not able to give you THE WORD on how to successfully initiate and conduct a program of bibliographic instruction at each of your institutions.

I have titled my talk this morning "Bibliographic Instruction: Defining, Organizing, and Promoting a Program," and, while I would like to think I have learned some things from my experiences both at DePauw University and Kearney State College, I have brought very few answers with me. I hope to raise some questions, stimulate some thoughts on your part, and in general encourage an exchange of ideas among us so we can learn from one another.

I plan to spend some time defining bibliographic instruction and ways I think are useful in organizing a bibliographic instruction program, but these two topics are covered much better by others in library literature. I really want to emphasize ways to promote a program of bibliographic instruction. How does one get it adopted?

There is some information on this in library literature, but I want to draw upon the growing body of knowledge coming out of education, sociology, and other fields on the communication of innovation. I think librarians can learn a great deal from this area, and as a good librarian, I plan to recommend at least one good book that you will find helpful.

It's Not New and It's Not Easy

I recently read a statement by the president of a major Ivy League University concerning the bibliographic skills of college students. He wrote:

> The average college student . . . is ignorant of the greater part of the bibliographic apparatus which the skilled librarian has in hourly use, to enable him to answer the thousand queries of the public. A little systematic instruction would so start our students in the right methods, that for the rest of their lives all their work in libraries would be more expeditiously accomplished.[1]

Also, I recently read the following statement by a well-known librarian, a leader in the field: "The colleges are waking to the fact that the work of every professor and every department is necessarily based on the library."[2]

It is good to know that such eminent individuals are seeing the need and believing that something can be done about it. I think considerable progress has been made recently in the area of bibliographic instruction. Certainly the Library Service Enhancement Program and the College Library Program are steps forward. The recent adoption of "Guidelines for Bibliographic Instruction in

Academic Libraries"[3] and the establishment of a Bibliographic Instruction Task Force Section by the Association of College and Research Libraries[4] are encouraging.

However, the need has been recognized for many years. Last year, for those of you that were here then, we heard Dr. Dix talk of Harvie Branscomb's work Teaching with Books. Branscomb examined numerous studies of student use of the academic library and concluded that "the mass of undergraduates make very little use of the main book collections."[5] At one school in his study, identified only as University A, he reported that forty-two percent of the students did not make any use of the general collection during the period studied, as indicated by circulation statistics.[6] We should remember that the Branscomb book was first published in 1940, almost two generations ago. Librarians have known about the problem of non-use of the academic library for a long time, and there is considerable evidence that the problem remains.

In the early 1950's, Patricia Knapp completed her major study at Knox College and found that 48.1 percent of the student body there did not withdraw any books during the quarter studied.[7] In 1965, Patrick Barkey reported at Eastern Illinois University that in two thirty-day studies over sixty percent of the student body did not withdraw any books.[8] We can update such evidence of non-use of the academic library to the very present.

In my own studies, both at DePauw University and Kearney State College, I have similar indications of student non-use of the academic library. In 1974, at Kearney State College I found that approximately

fifty-three percent of the full-time undergraduate students did not circulate any library materials during the last half of the second semester (approximately seven and one-half weeks).[9] More recently, at DePauw University, approximately forty-one percent of the students did not circulate any library items during the entire second semester of the 1975-1976 academic year.

Additional evidence of the non-use of the academic library can be found by studying circulation of recent acquisitions. A recent study at the University of Pittsburgh indicates that approximately forty percent of a recent year's acquisitions went uncirculated after seven years.[10] At DePauw University, a small liberal arts college, I found that approximately forty percent of the books acquired during a six-month period remained uncirculated after three years. This problem is complicated by the lack of knowledge on the part of students who do use the library, and I think we all are reminded of this whenever we sit at a reference desk. The point is that the problem of student non-use of the library and lack of knowledge of how to use the library are not new.

More important to keep in mind is that librarians have been trying to solve the problem for a long time. The college president I quoted at the beginning of this section (see p. 3) was the President of Columbia University, and the statement is from the Annual Report of the President, dated 1883. The eminent librarian I quoted (see p. 3) was Melvil Dewey, and his article was written in 1888.

For those of us who are relatively new to the profession and have only recently discovered bibliographic instruction, it is difficult to

appreciate the efforts that have gone before us. In the September 1976 issue of The Journal of Academic Librarianship, the editors cautioned readers that bibliographic instruction is not a new idea, and advised those new to the field "to review the literature in order to become acquainted with past experiences."[11]

Beatrice Beech of the Waldo Library of Western Michigan University reported in 1977 that she found evidence of bibliographic instruction at that library as early as 1925. It consisted of a course of ten lessons and was required of all freshmen.[12] There is, no doubt, evidence of bibliographic instruction at other schools for even earlier periods, and we even may have lost ground over the years in terms of programs of bibliographic instruction.

This should give you the impression, if you do not already have it, that establishing a successful program of bibliographic instruction is not easy. In a survey during the mid-1960's, Barbara Phipps found that eighty-one percent of the 157 responding libraries reported giving some form of library instruction, but fifty-seven percent of these respondents indicated that their programs were failing to meet their needs.[13] One only needs to read through the report by Patricia Knapp on the Monteith College Library Experimert, one of the more carefully planned and studied attempts at extensive bibliographic instruction, to gain a sense of the difficulties and frustrations that can arise in implementing a program of bibliographic instruction.

Recently, the Council on Library Resources reported that nearly all of the participants of the College Library Program had to make major modifications in their plans at the end of either the first or second

year of their programs. (The evaluators did point out, though, that the College Library Program had many benefits.)[14]

A key issue in a program of bibliographic instruction is gaining acceptance, and innovations and new ideas are not easily adopted. In the commercial marketplace, it has been estimated that only one idea out of approximately 500 results in a successful new product.[15] Approximately eight percent out of the more than 6,000 new consumer items introduced each year have a life expectancy of even one year.[16] Innovations and new ideas, whether they be in business, agriculture, education, or librarianship, often have a short and difficult life, or are adopted only after many years of struggle.

Examples of this process abound in public education at the secondary and elementary levels. Kindergarten is one example. After its introduction, more than fifty years lapsed before kindergarten was widely adopted in the 1930's and 1940's. It still has not been adopted in every state in the country. Many school systems remain untouched by post-Sputnik developments such as programmed learning, educational games, and educational media (for example, instructional television).

I will discuss again later the problems of innovation, but I hope you appreciate the difficulties involved in bibliographic instruction and the fact that success is not inevitable. It takes some careful planning and a lot of hard work. I do not think there is anyone today who would claim that they have all or even most of the answers. Of course, we all have great expectations for the 1977-78 recipients of the Library Service Enhancement Program grants. Perhaps you have just felt a great burden settle on your shoulders.

What Is Bibliographic Instruction and How Should a Bibliographic Instruction Program Be Organized

I should spend a few minutes outlining what I believe is meant by bibliographic instruction, and how I think a program of bibliographic instruction should be organized. I really have taken many of my ideas from the literature, but my own experiences also confirm these thoughts. In fact, I first outlined what I had to say on this subject based on my experiences and then went to the literature to see what was there. I found that almost everything I had to say had already been said. It is probably a case of me forgetting where I got my information in the first place. I suppose I could have typed up a bibliography and sent it to each of you in lieu of this section of the talk, but then I would have missed talking with each of you, and of course the trip to Washington, D.C.

My own experiences have emphasized the need for carefully defining and planning a bibliographic instruction program. It is not simply a flurry of activity and trying to get into as many classrooms as possible. There is simply too much to do and too few librarians to try to accomplish everything at once. I was a little amused by one of the questions asked last year by the Council on Library Resources for the final report. The question was "Can you speculate on reasons for apathy or lack of interest on the part of faculty?"

First, this question presupposes that there was apathy among the faculty at DePauw University towards bibliographic instruction, and that it was a serious problem. No doubt there is apathy towards bibliographic instruction at DePauw, but I had too much to do handling the faculty who

were interested in bibliographic instruction to worry much about those who were not interested.

I did a survey of the social science and humanities faculty at DePauw University. A sociology professor, a political science professor, another librarian, and I designed the survey form, and we sent it to 123 classroom faculty. We received sixty-six returns, slightly over a fifty percent return rate (which is evidence of apathy at DePauw). One of the questions was:

> How many hours would you estimate that it would take to teach use of basic library resources and literature searching techniques to students in your discipline?
>
> a. none 0 b. 1 hour 11 c. 1-3 hours 23 d. 4-6 hours 15
>
> e. 6-8 hours 7 f. 8 or more hours 6

The next question was:

> A librarian-directed review of library resources and literature searching techniques in my discipline would be a valuable experience for my students.
>
> Strongly agree 37 Agree 20 Undecided 6
>
> Disagree 1 Strongly disagree 0

The final question on this area was:

> If such a review were offered by the librarians, would you be willing to cooperate in its development?
>
> Yes 58 No 1 Undecided 5 No response 2

While I do not claim this to be a one hundred percent accurate reflection of the thoughts towards bibliographic instruction at Delauw University, I think it indicates that I do not have a problem of a lack of things to do. You, no doubt, probably share this situation. It is easy to do

a lot of work with bibliographic instruction, but it is much more difficult to accomplish quality instruction.

During my first year at Kearney State College we involved some 2,000 students (out of a total enrollment of nearly 5,000 students) in some form of bibliographic instruction or orientation. In evaluating our efforts, we found that we had spread ourselves so thin that we were not doing justice to many students. Without any systematic plan we found overlap among students--in the sense that one student might see basically the same presentation two or three times. We also found that many of the students were not returning to the library to apply what we had taught them. Partial evidence of this came in my circulation study: fifty-three percent of the full-time undergraduates did not circulate any library items during the second semester of that year. The Kearney experience caused some major rethinking on my part.

Since that time I have worked on developing a systematic program of bibliographic instruction. This involves analyzing the various elements of bibliographic instruction to determine what they are and at what stages they are best implemented. This idea is certainly not original with me, and a series of journal articles and essays in the literature have influenced my efforts. These articles are well worth reading for anyone interested in bibliographic instruction. The following is a partial list:

Patricia Knapp, "A Suggested Program of College Instruction in the Use of the Library," Library Quarterly XXVI (July, 1956), pp. 224-231.

James Kennedy, Jr., "Integrated Library Instruction," Library Journal (April 15, 1970), pp. 1450-1453.

Martha Hackman, "Proposal for a Program of Library Instruction," Drexel Library Quarterly, Vol. 7 (July-October, 1971), pp. 299-308.

Marvin E. Wiggins, "The Development of Library Use Instructional Programs," College & Research Libraries, (November, 1972), pp. 473-479.

Evan Farber, "Library Instruction throughout the Curriculum: Earlham College Program," Educating the Library User, ed. John Lubans (New York: R. R. Bowker Co., 1974), pp. 145-162.

Miriam Dudley, "Teaching Library Skills to College Students," Advances in Librarianship, Vol. 3 (Seminary Press, 1972), pp. 83-105.

Elizabeth Frick, "Information Structure and Bibliographic Instruction," The Journal of Academic Librarianship, Vol. 1, No. 4 (September, 1975), pp. 12-14.

John MacGregor and Raymond G. McInnis, "Integrating Classroom Instruction and Library Research: The Cognitive Functions of Bibliographic Network Structures," Journal of Higher Education, Vol. XLVIII, No. 1 (January/February, 1977), pp. 17-38.

These articles spell in much more detail what I have in mind concerning bibliographic instruction. I will present here a somewhat simplified version of my definition of bibliographic instruction.

The first stage involves simply making students aware of the academic library in a general sense. I have a fifteen-minute slide show I present during the first week of each semester in freshman English and basic communication courses. I briefly discuss the role of of librarians in helping students, the major collections of the library, and the types of services available in the academic library (such as an after-hours room for late night studying and copying machines). At the end of the presentation I point out the availability of a self-guided tour pamphlet and stress the importance of using it.

An important element of this stage is simply fostering a positive attitude on the part of the students towards the library and the librarians. Hopefully they will begin to view librarians as sources of assistance, and they will use the self-guided tour to learn the general physical location of materials and services within the library. Approximately 1,000 of these guides were distributed in this manner by having the students voluntarily pick them up on a table near the main entrance of the library. In follow-up surveys approximately forty percent of the freshmen involved in the instruction program indicated using the self-guided tour. This is one method of eliminating the guided tour, which I think does as many bad things as good. Several of the authors I have mentioned either have eliminated the library tour or provide only a brief orientation to freshman students.

The second stage, as I see it, is the introduction of the students to use of the major collections of the library through use of a general search strategy. I try to do this as part of the freshman English and basic communication classes at DePauw University. For each class, two forty-five minute slide presentations are given. To accompany the presentations and to aid the students in completing a course assignment, an instruction booklet and a worksheet are provided. The worksheet insures that the students actually go through the process (though it is not foolproof); the instruction booklet serves as reinforcement and as later reference. I also give the students a brief quiz on key points at the end of each presentation and go over the quizzes with them. At the end of the semester I provide the students with a two-page evaluation form to give me feedback concerning the program.

I try to make the presentations relate as closely as possible to a regular composition assignment. Meetings are scheduled with each instructor before the presentations, and the instructors are required to attend the classes. The attendance of the instructors fulfills two purposes. First, the students tend to consider the presentations more important if the regular instructor is present and participating. Second, it is a way of teaching the classroom instructors about the library, as several of the classroom instructors have told me.

I have tried to follow Marvin Wiggins' advice to build in a high level of success for the students in their initial contact with the library. Students should feel the time they spend is worthwhile[17] in order to provide the motivation to learn. Motivation also is much higher when the library instruction is related to or integrated into an actual course assignment.

Last year this introduction to a general search strategy involved approximately ninety percent of the freshman students at DePauw University. Sixteen instructors, twenty-eight classes and about 560 students participated. This second stage builds the foundation for bibliographic instruction at the upper levels of college.

The third stage of the program involves the introduction of the more specialized library resources to students as they begin to take courses in their major fields. I am just beginning to work in this area, and I think it will be some time before a systematic program is widely established at DePauw University. Approximately twenty class periods of instruction were given during the past academic year and fifteen this current semester.

The main difficulty at this stage is the identification of entry level courses for each discipline in which a majority of the students enroll. It is in these courses that I would like to concentrate discipline-related bibliographic instruction. One reason for this is to avoid overlap in providing instruction to the students; a second reason is to save time and effort on the part of the librarians.

As part of this stage I have developed a series of discipline-related bibliographic guides. Miriam Dudley states in her article that such guides are a "stopgap" approach to bibliographic instruction, but they are one way to stretch my efforts. Approximately twenty such booklets have been developed--mainly while sitting at the reference desk--and each is ten to twenty pages long. During the past two years approximately 5,000 bibliographic guides have been distributed at DePauw, which has an enrollment of some 2,300 students.

The fourth stage of bibliographic instruction involves the attempt to teach upper level students the relationship between the nature of a particular discipline and the nature of the structure or organization of the literature of that discipline. I think this is the most challenging part of bibliographic instruction and the part we know least about. The literature of some disciplines seems to have a natural organization that does not necessarily parallel the way we librarians organize the information in the library. I may be wrong, but I think this is a relatively recent idea in library instruction.

Elizabeth Frick has written an excellent article on this subject.[18] Also, recently the Journal of Higher Education published an article by John MacGregor, a sociologist, and Raymond McInnis, a reference librarian,

on the cognitive functions of bibliographic network structures.[19] This article is also very interesting on this stage of bibliographic instruction, and I hope some of you work in this area to further define it and to measure students' understanding of it.

Implementing a Program of Bibliographic Instruction

This outlines my definition of bibliographic instruction and suggestions for organizing a systematic bibliographic instruction program. The next step is implementing a program. Incidentally, librarians are not the only people with the missionary spirit these days. I have been working on a degree in instructional development at Indiana University, and I have found that the media people are equally infected with this spirit.

As part of the curriculum at Indiana University, there are several courses on how to promote new ideas in instructional development and media. The background for these courses, as I stated earlier, has grown out of studies from such diverse areas as education, anthropology, rural sociology, and experiences with the Peace Corps. You may not think of yourselves as such, but perhaps you are the equivalent of Peace Corps volunteers in the area of bibliographic instruction.

Studies conducted on such topics as the adoption of hybrid seed corn in agriculture and programmed learning in education have led researchers to certain conclusions that I think are highly relevant for promoting bibliographic instruction. I can do little more today

than provide you with a sample of these conclusions, but I do want to recommend a good book on the subject. The book is Communication of Innovation by Everett Rogers. Do read it.

I have attempted to glean some of the more important conclusions from the books I have read in this area to pass on to you this morning. This section of my talk is organized around four areas: the innovation, the social system, the individual, and how to handle success.

The Innovation

The characteristics of the innovation affect the adoption of an innovation. Rogers, in his work, outlines several characteristics of innovations which contribute to the adoption of innovations. Perhaps we can relate them to bibliographic instruction. The characteristics are as follows:

> 1. Relative Advantage: The degree to which an innovation is perceived by the adopter as better than the idea it supersedes. The greater the perceived relative advantage of an innovation, the more rapid its rate of adoption.[20]

An important point that Rogers makes is that this characteristic must be perceived by the adopter. Patricia Knapp concluded from her research that:

> Most college faculty members see library instruction as dealing with bits of information, undeniably useful, but fragmented, not related to any single, coherent framework, not calling for problem-solving behavior, for critical thinking, for imagination. Most college students see it as sheer high school busy work.[21]

The view classroom faculty have of library instruction is critical since Knapp and others have found that students' "needs" to use the library are usually derived from the value placed upon such work by their

instructors.[22] There is considerable research available that points out the critical role of the classroom instructor in determining student use of the library.

Compatibility is a second element that Rogers considers important. He defines it as follows:

> 2. Compatibility: The degree to which an innovation is perceived by the adopter as being consistent with existing values, past experiences, and the needs of the receivers.[23]

While there may be high agreement among classroom instructors that the library is a "good thing," they may not agree that librarians should or need to be providing bibliographic instruction. Patricia Knapp found that often classroom instructors felt that all instruction about bibliographic work should be done by them,[24] or that it was the province of the classroom instructors, not librarians, to recommend sources of information.[25]

In my survey of the humanities and social science faculty at DePauw University I included the following statement:

> Optimum use of a college library as a learning tool depends upon the following conditions. Please rank in order of importance.
>
> 36 (55%) The maintenance of collections which are adequate in size and scope to support independent study and investigation
>
> 21 (32%) Faculty presentations of a kind which inspire students to use the resources of the library intensively
>
> 8 (12%) Library instruction which will enable students to use the library effectively

I suspect that a group of librarians might rank these statements in a different order. This ranking may reflect what Evan Farber refers to

as the "university-library syndrome" of classroom instructors--an over-emphasis on large collections which grows out of graduate school training at the large research institutions most of the classroom instructors attended.[26]

Another question I asked in the survey was:

> In your graduate work, how did you learn to use the library resources? (Please circle all appropriate items.)
>
> 58 (88%) a. Learned through My Own Efforts
>
> 31 (47%) b. Learned from Other Graduate Students
>
> 34 (52%) c. Learned through Informal Consultation with Professors
>
> 21 (32%) d. Learned in a Graduate Course in (or as Part of a Course in) Library Usage Taught by a Departmental Instructor
>
> 34 (47%) e. Learned through Informal Consultation with a Librarian
>
> 3 (5%) f. Learned in a Graduate Course in Library Usage Taught by a Librarian
>
> 1 g. No Need for Use of Library Resources in My Graduate Work

Such experiences by classroom instructors no doubt contribute to their perceptions of bibliographic instruction and the need for it.

A third element of an innovation considered important by Rogers is complexity. He defines it as follows:

> 3. Complexity: The degree to which an innovation is perceived as difficult to understand and use.[27]

Stated simply, the more difficult it is to understand and use an innovation, the less likely it will be used. A program of bibliographic instruction such as I have described could involve some major curriculum

changes and re-thinking on the part of classroom instructors. Bibliographic instruction tends to be process oriented, while classroom instructors tend to emphasize the accumulation of knowledge on the part of students.

One major study on programmed learning found that often teachers would not fully accept this method because of their perceived need to "perform". The researcher found that instructors often define teaching as capturing and holding the attention of a number of students, and serving continuously as the mediator between the students and information. The teachers often viewed programmed instruction as a threat to their concept of teaching and consciously or unconsciously did several things to counter its effectiveness.[28] There may be a warning here for librarians attempting to promote independent learning of library resources by students. In general, new ideas that can be added to an existing program without seriously disturbing other parts of it are more likely to be adopted.[29]

A fourth element Rogers discusses is trialability. He defines trialability as:

> 4. Trialability: The degree to which an innovation may be experimented with on a limited basis.[30]

A distinct advantage of bibliographic instruction may be its trialability. Innovations requiring large expenditures of time, money, or effort by the adopting person or group are likely to move slowly.[31] I like the advice of Jim Kennedy of Earlham College, who suggests that librarians should be like the Volkswagen people and "think small"--in the beginning anyway.[32]

Observability is the fifth element discussed by Rogers. He defines it as:

> 5. Observability: The degree to which the results of an innovation are visible to others.[33]

Again, simply stated, people have to see the results to believe it. Concerning bibliographic instruction, an important point is whether classroom instructors can observe that bibliographic instruction helps students achieve the objectives determined by the classroom instructors.

The Social System

The social system or structure plays an important role in the acceptance of innovation. One researcher in this area, Matthew Miles, concludes in his book Innovation in Education:

> Educational innovations are almost never installed on their own merits. Characteristics of the local system, of the innovating person or group, and of other relevant groups, often outweigh the impact of what the innovation is.[34]

Again it is Patricia Knapp in the library profession who has given the most attention to the relationship between the social structure of the academic community and bibliographic instruction.[35] Evan Farber at Earlham College has pointed out the importance of the "closely knit sense of community and very informal relationships among students, faculty, administration, and staff" at that institution in regard to bibliographic instruction.[36]

In general, researchers emphasize the role of a limited number of individuals in the social system. In attempting any planned change, "legitimacy for the change must be gained through obtaining the support of key people."[37] These people are not necessarily the formal leaders

of the organization.[38] They may be those deemed the "opinion leaders" because of the way they are able to influence informally the attitudes and actions of others.[39] Rogers concludes that the success of a change agent is positively related to the extent that he or she works through these opinion leaders.[40] For example, Patricia Knapp reported in the Monteith College Project that "the support of a powerful member of the staff could practically guarantee an initial hearing for our ideas."[41]

Convincing opinion leaders of the need for bibliographic instruction is a very important element of a successful program, and hard work and persistence can pay off. Rogers has concluded, in fact, that "change agent success is positively related to the extent of change agent effort,"[42] which is certainly good to know.

The Individual

Researchers have concluded that an individual's decision about an innovation is not an instantaneous act. Rather it is a process that occurs over a period of time and consists of a series of actions. One model of the process is as follows:

1. Awareness stage: The individual learns of the existence of the new idea but lacks information about it.
2. Interest stage: The individual develops interest in the innovation and seeks additional information about it.
3. Evaluation stage: The individual makes mental application of the new idea to his present and anticipated future and decides whether or not to try it.
4. Trial stage: The individual actually applies the new idea on a small scale in order to determine its utility in his own situation.
5. Adoption stage: The individual uses the new idea continuously on a full scale.[43]

This is a useful model to keep in mind, and it has worked in my experience.

An educational game is available that is based on this model. The game was developed by Dr. Mike Molenda of the division of instructional technology of Indiana University. Instead of a library, the premise is that a reading teacher is funded for two years to go into a school district to promote the idea of peer teaching. The game is set up to emphasize the role of opinion leaders, informal social structures, the adoption process, and the difficulties and frustrations involved in being a change agent. If you get a chance to use it sometime, I highly recommend it.

It is interesting that research indicates that certain strategies work at certain stages of the adoption process. For example, print materials such as pamphlets tend to work only at the first stage, the awareness stage. They seem to do very little to convince individuals to try an innovation. Bringing in an outside expert to lecture tends not to be effective. Compelling individuals to adopt an innovation seldom is effective on a long term basis.

Some things that are effective in the trial and evaluation stages are getting instructors to sit in on the classes of other instructors who have adopted an innovation, and I have tried this recently at DePauw with some success. Also, a site visit to another school or college that has adopted an innovation is supposed to be very effective. I think one of the more successful things I have done is to take two of our Biology faculty to visit Earlham for a day.

There are three things that research indicates that work in all stages of the process. You might even want to write them down. They are PERSONAL CONTACT, PERSONAL CONTACT, and PERSONAL CONTACT. Continued personal contact is very effective. At DePauw University I sometimes feel like one of the performers on the old Ed Sullivan Show--you know, the one that keeps all the plates spinning on the end of sticks, and must keep running from one to another to keep them all going. However, one message from the literature is that you need not work on everyone, but can be highly effective by concentrating on the opinion leaders.

How Do You Handle Success

A most important message from the literature on the adoption of innovation is that one cannot relax once an innovation seemingly is adopted. Researchers have found that potential adopters often are willing to go along with a new idea, but if not prepared for some initial frustrations and difficulties in implementing the changes, resistance can soon develop.[44] This early frustration and difficulty often is accentuated by a tendency towards unrealistic goal-setting and too-high aspirations, which in turn creates overload and fatigue.[45] I think all of us last year suffered from overload and fatigue by the end of the year.

One final point in this area is evaluation. In the field of education there is considerable evidence that innovations rarely are evaluated on a systematic basis.[46] I think this is also true of bibliographic instruction, although the more I learn about evaluation, the more difficult it seems.

Too often we judge bibliographic instruction as a success simply if an instructor asks us to repeat it. I want to share with you a

statement by one educational researcher:

> . . .[T]he creators of experimental programs often impress one as being men of conviction who have little question about the efficacy of the changes they have introduced. They know that the courses they have developed are the best possible under existing conditions; and in the light of this assumed fact, systematic evaluation seems superfluous.[47]

I would hope that you all evaluate your programs.

Within instructional development there are distinctions in the kinds of evaluation. One type is formative evaluation. This evaluation is used in the educational program as it is being developed. It provides the developer with feedback during the initial stages of the program itself. With this information the program can be modified until it is effective. This type of evaluation need not be highly sophisticated, but it is important. Written comments by the students may be sufficient.

The other type of evaluation is summative evaluation. It assesses whether or not the students actually learned what they were supposed to learn. This stage comes only after considerable formative evaluation and a high level of confidence is developed in the instructional program. Summative evaluation will probably be much less useful to you this year if you have just started a program of bibliographic instruction.

Conclusion

Before I have convinced you of the impossibility of your task, I should bring this talk to a conclusion. I do want to leave you with one final quote. During the past two years I have been working on gathering information on the use of slide-tape presentations in

academic libraries because I think they offer a number of advantages in our efforts to promote bibliographic instruction. During the course of this project, I corresponded with Beulah Howison, Coordinator of Public Services at the University of Wisconsin-Stout. I have never met her, and she is now retired, but she provided me with good advice several times during the project. In one of her letters she summed up her experiences with the development of slide-tape presentations, and I think it adequately sums up my experiences as Project Librarian last year under the Library Service Enhancement Program. Perhaps you will have similar thoughts by the end of this year. Beulah wrote:

> It is very time consuming!
>
> It is challenging!
>
> It is drudgery!
>
> It is maddening!
>
> I wouldn't have missed the experience for anything!

FOOTNOTES

1. Columbia University, Annual Report of the President. . . (1883), p. 46.

2. Melvil Dewey, "Libraries as Related to the Educational Work of the State," Library Notes, III (1888), pp. 333-348.

3. "Guidelines for Bibliographic Instruction in Academic Libraries," College & Research Libraries News, No. 4 (April, 1977), p. 92.

4. "ACRL Bibliographic Instruction Section Formed," College & Research Libraries News, No. 5 (May, 1977), p. 125.

5. Harvie Branscomb, Teaching with Books (Chicago: Association of American Colleges, 1940), p. 37.

6. Ibid., p. 29.

7. Patricia Knapp, College Teaching and the College Library (Chicago: American Library Association, 1959), p. 23.

8. Patrick Barkey, "Patterns of Student Use of a Library," College & Research Libraries, Vol. 26 (March, 1965), p. 121.

9. Larry Hardesty, "The Academic Library: Unused and Unneeded?" Library Scene, Vol. 4, No. 4 (December, 1975/March, 1976), p. 15.

10. Thomas J. Galvin and Allen Kent, "Use of a University Library Collection: A Progress Report on a Pittsburgh Study," Library Journal, Vol. 102, No. 21 (November 15, 1977), p. 2318.

11. Richard Doughtery and William Webb, "Editorial: Library Instruction," The Journal of Academic Librarianship, Vol. 2, No. 4 (September, 1976), p. 171.

12. Beatrice Beech, "The History of Library Instruction," The Journal of Academic Librarianship, Vol. 3, No. 4 (September, 1977), p. 214.

13. Patricia B. Knapp, The Monteith College Library Experiment (New York: Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1966).

14. Council on Library Resources, Inc. 20th Annual Report, 1976: Council on Library Resources, Inc. (Washington, D.C.: Council on Library Resources, Inc., 1977), p. 54.

15. Elizabeth Martin, New Products, New Profits (New York: American Management Association, 1964), p. 9, as cited by Everett M. Rogers, Communication of Innovation (New York: The Free Press, 1971), p. 68.

16. John T. Conner, "Progress Reshapes Competition," Printers' Ink, Vol. 287 (1964), p. 36, as cited by Rogers, Communication of Innovation, p. 68.

17. Marvin Wiggins, "The Development of Library Use Instruction Programs," College & Research Libraries (November, 1972), p. 474.

18. Elizabeth Frick, "Information Structure and Bibliographic Instruction," The Journal of Academic Librarianship, Vol. 1, No. 4 (September, 1975), pp. 12-14.

19. John MacGregor and Raymond G. McInnis, "Integrating Classroom Instruction and Library Research: The Cognitive Functions of Bibliographic Network Structures," Journal of Higher Education, Vol. XLVIII, No. 1 (January/February, 1977), pp. 17-38.

20. Everett M. Rogers, Communication of Innovation (New York: The Free Press, 1971), pp. 22-23.

21. Knapp, Monteith College, p. 89.

22. Ibid., p. 39.

23. Rogers, Communication of Innovation, pp. 22-23.

24. Knapp, Monteith College, p. 183.

25. Ibid., p. 171.

26. Evan Ira Farber, "Limiting College Library Growth: Bane or Boom?" The Journal of Academic Librarianship, Vol. 1, No. 5 (November, 1975), p. 13.

27. Rogers, Communication of Innovation, p. 23.

28. Richard O. Carlson, Adoption of Educational Innovations (Eugene, Oregon: The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1965), p. 83.

29. Matthew B. Miles, "Innovation in Education: Some Generalizations," Innovation in Education, ed. Matthew B. Miles (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964), p. 638.

30. Rogers, Communication of Innovation, p. 23.

31. Miles, "Innovation in Education," p. 635.

32. James Kennedy, "A Separate Course in Bibliographic Instruction," Library Orientation, ed. Sul Lee (Ann Arbor, 1972), p. 23.

33. Rogers, Communication of Innovation, p. 23.

34. Miles, "Innovation in Education," p. 635.

35. Knapp, Monteith College, pp. 19-38.

36. Evan Farber, "Library Education," p. 145.

37. Warren G. Bennis and Edgar Schein, The Planning of Change, 2nd ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969), p. 354.

38. Kenneth Benne and Max Birnbaum, "Principles of Change," The Planning of Change, p. 333.

39. Rogers, Communication of Innovation, p. 29.

40. Ibid., p. 243.

41. Knapp, Monteith College, p. 133.

42. Rogers, Communication of Innovation, p. 233.

43. Ibid.

44. N. Gross and others, Implementing Organizational Innovations: A Sociological Analysis of Planned Educational Change (New York: Basic Books, 1971), p. 209.

45. Miles, "Innovation in Education," p. 656.

46. Ibid., p. 657.

47. Patrick Kendall, "Evaluating an Experimental Program in Medical Education," Innovation in Education, p. 344.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION:

A SELECT LIST OF RECOMMENDED READINGS FOR

DEFINING, ORGANIZING, AND PROMOTING A PROGRAM

by

Larry Hardesty
DePauw University

Dudley, Miriam. "Teaching Library Skills to College Students," Advances in Librarianship, Vol. 3, 1972, pp. 83-105.

Farber, Evan. "Library Instruction throughout the Curriculum: Earlham College Program," Educating the Library User, ed. John Lubans (New York: R. R. Bowker Co., 1974), pp. 145-162.

Frick, Elizabeth. "Information Structure and Bibliographic Instruction," The Journal of Academic Librarianship, Vol. 1, No. 4 (September, 1975), pp. 12-14.

Hackman, Martha. "Proposal for a Program of Library Instruction," Drexel Library Quarterly, Vol. 7 (July-October, 1971), pp. 299-308.

Kennedy, James. "Integrated Library Instruction," Library Journal, Vol. 95, No. 8 (April 15, 1970), pp. 1450-1453.

Knapp, Patricia. "A Suggested Program of College Instruction in the Use of the Library," Library Quarterly, XXVI (July, 1956), pp. 224-231.

MacGregor, John, and Raymond McInnis. "Integrating Classroom Instruction and Library Research: The Cognitive Functions of Bibliographic Network Structures," Journal of Higher Education, Vol. XLVIII, No. 1 (January/February, 1977), pp. 17-38.

Rogers, Everett M., with F. Floyd Shoemaker. Communication of Innovation. 2d ed. (New York: The Free Press, 1971).